

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of JOSHUA JAMES
MCCLANAHAN, NATHAN DONALD
MCCLANAHAN, STEPHAN MICHAEL
MCCLANAHAN, and HAYLEY
MCCLANAHAN, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

BEVERLY MCCLANAHAN,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
January 15, 2008

No. 279748
Kalkaska Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 05-003742-NA

Before: Davis, P.J., and Murphy and White, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from an order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g) and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCL 712A.19b(3); MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Respondent was offered numerous services, both before and after the children were removed, but was either unable or unwilling to apply the parenting and disciplinary techniques that she was taught. In particular, she lacked meaningful interaction with the children during visits, continued to yell at and threaten them, did not follow up with appropriate discipline, was not nurturing or empathetic, and had to be prompted to change and feed the children. Additionally, she failed to recognize safety hazards and was unable to attend to more than one child at a time, even when other children were exposed to dangerous situations. In sum, respondent lacked the necessary skills to adequately parent and care for the children. Moreover, at the time of the termination hearing, respondent remained unemployed and was dependent upon her parents for housing and support. Considering respondent's limited cognitive abilities, her resistance to learning, her inability to apply what she was taught, and her entrenched belief that she was not doing anything wrong, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that there was no reasonable likelihood that respondent would be able to rectify the conditions that caused the children to come within the court's jurisdiction or be able to

provide proper care and custody within a reasonable time, and that there was a reasonable likelihood that the children would be harmed if returned to respondent.

Further, the evidence did not clearly show that termination of respondent's parental rights was not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 353-354, 356; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). There was evidence that the children's bond with respondent was weak and superficial, not meaningful and strong, and that the children were apathetic concerning whether respondent was present or not. The trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Alton T. Davis

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Helene N. White